

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's thorough examination of the present application. Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20, and 22-26 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance and thus respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and allow Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20, and 22-26 in view of the foregoing remarks.

35 USC §112 Claim Rejection

1. The Examiner has indicated difficulty in finding support for the previously presented amendment of "no portion of the taskbar is visible or accessible to the remote user." See Office Action Dated April 18, 2007, at page 2. The Applicants submit that support for this limitation is provided throughout the specification and drawings, and more specifically in paragraphs 033-038 and in FIG. 3B. For example, FIG. 3B shows a "[s]harer display 321 [that] contains two regions: a sharer **taskbar** region 322 and a sharer desktop region 323." See paragraph 033. "In this embodiment, only the desktop region 323 of display 321 is shared and appears in window 334. Control area 326 is placed in the taskbar region 322, **which is not shared.**" See paragraph 035. Furthermore, FIG. 3B also shows an embodiment wherein the viewer region displays no portion of the taskbar, and thus, the taskbar is inaccessible to the remote user. Therefore, the specification supports that, at the time the application was filed, the Applicants had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants therefore submit that Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 are in condition for allowance, and accordingly request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §112 rejection.

Art Rejections

A. 103 Rejection

1. Claims 1-12, 14, 16 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Screen Dumps of Window Media Player 9 used on Windows XP (“Windows”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,961,416 to *Ludwig et al. (Ludwig)*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

As stated in MPEP § 2143.01, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Windows is directed towards a windowing system that includes a display region, a desktop region, and a taskbar region. Windows is also directed towards an application that displays and/or plays various media formats. The Examiner relied upon the taskbar region, which usually sits at the bottom of the windows display region, as anticipating the claimed “taskbar region” or “sharer taskbar region” in the pending claims. Applicants respectfully disagree because this taskbar region corresponds to the Toolbar Region 107 as shown in Figure 1 of the present application, and this Toolbar region 107 is clearly different from the Taskbar Region 101, which is the actual claimed element. *See* Figure 1 of the application. To further distinguish the application from Windows, Applicants previously amended independent Claim 1 to include a limitation of “wherein . . . at least a portion of the desktop region can be shared by a local user of the user interface with a remote user in a multimedia collaborative session, and no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user.” Examiner agrees that “Windows does not specifically teach an interface wherein at least a portion of the desktop region can be shared by a local user of the user interface with a remote user in a multimedia collaborative session, and no portion of the taskbar region visible or accessible to the remote user.” *See* Office Action at page 4. However, the Examiner submits that Ludwig cures this deficiency. Applicants

respectfully submit, as will be detailed below, that *Ludwig* does not, either expressly or inherently, teach or suggest elements recited in the pending claims.

(a.) Ludwig does not teach or suggest the inventive concept of sharing a window with a remote user where no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user.

Ludwig discloses a multimedia collaboration for conducting teleconferences among a plurality of participants. See *Ludwig* at the Abstract. The system described in *Ludwig* also provides the users the ability to share snapshots of information, shared whiteboard space, applications and associated telepointing and annotation capabilities.

The examiner equates the system disclosed by *Ludwig* for teaching or suggesting that “no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user”. The examiner cites to the “Snapshot Share” disclosed by *Ludwig*, column 29, lines 6-11, as teaching sharing a region of the desktop to a remote user while no portion of the taskbar region is visible:

As described above in connection with collaborative workstation software, snapshot Share 514 shown in FIG. 30 is a utility used in multimedia calls and conferencing for capturing window or screen snapshots, sharing with one or more call or conference participants, and permitting group annotation, telepointing, and re-grabs.

The Examiner submits that “[s]ince a user is able to only share a window or selected regions, there is no portion of the taskbar that is visible or accessible.” See page 4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse this argument.

Applicants submit, that the Snapshot Share window in *Ludwig* teaches sharing an entire window with other users. In contrast to the claimed invention, the Snapshot Share windows provide the ability of **either** party to manipulate the material in the shared window. Thus, the operational and functionality buttons used to control, operate, or manipulate the data, e.g., control areas in the taskbar region, are included within the window such that they are both

visible and **accessible** to both parties. *Ludwig* states, that once the window is shared with a remote user,

[e]ither party to the share can annotate that image using the drawing tools 221 (and the TEXT button, which permits typed characters to be displayed) provided within Share window 211, or "regrab" a modified version of the original image (by using the **REGRAB** button), or **remove all such annotations** (by using the **CLEAR** button of Share window 211), or "grab" a new image to share (by clicking on the **GRAB** button of Share window 211 and selecting that new image from the screen). In addition, **any participant to a shared session can add a new participant by selecting that participant from the rolodex or quick-dial list** (as described above for video calls and for data conferencing) and clicking the **ADD** button of Share window 211. One can also save the shared image (**SAVE** button), load a previously saved image to be shared (**LOAD** button), or print an image (**PRINT** button).

Ludwig, Col. 36, lines 61-67, emphasis added.

The description and claimed limitations of the taskbar region and control area in the application are not similar to the entire Snapshot Share window disclosed in *Ludwig*. For example, in claim 1, Applicants provide that "one or more control areas [are] displayed within the taskbar region." A control area, as described in the specification, is an area within the taskbar region where the "application's functionality and control" is accessed by the user. See Application at least in paragraphs 019, 020, 021, 022 and 029. For example, claim 7 provides "each control area in the taskbar region includes a menu of control options." Claim 1 requires that **no portion** of the taskbar region, and thus the control area, be visible or accessible by the remote user.

In contrast, the Snapshot Share window of *Ludwig* **makes visible** and accessible all of the control and functionality of the window to both the local and remote users. Thus, unlike claim 1, *all* portions of the Snapshot Share window's taskbar region are visible and accessible to the remote user. As shown in FIGS. 2B, 36, 37, 40 and 41, the control and functionality buttons of the window, "Add", "Save", "Load", "Print", etc. are visible to all participants. *Ludwig*, in fact, teaches away from showing no portion of taskbar region because the window is configured for

sharing the control of the data in the window. Therefore, in view of *Ludwig*, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to share a window but share “no portion of the taskbar region.”

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that *Ludwig* does not teach or suggest showing only a portion of a window. *Ludwig* discloses showing the entire window for the application. Thus, although in *Ludwig* a user may share only a snapshot of a data file, e.g., a chart, and/or single window, one skilled in the art would not interpret this to mean the user may select only specific regions of the window to be shown. In contrast, *Ludwig* teaches that a plurality of windows may be shared at the same time: “[a]ny number of snapshots may be shared simultaneously.” *Ludwig*, col. 26, lines 29-31. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret *Ludwig* to teach that a portion of the taskbar may be hidden, and thus, does not disclose a collaborative session where “no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user.”

Because *Ludwig* cannot cure the deficiencies of Windows XP with respect to any independent claims or the claims that depend therefrom, and because there is no apparent reason to combine *Ludwig* and Windows XP, Applicants hereby respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-12, 14, 16 and 25 as being unpatentable over Windows XP in view of *Ludwig*.

2. Claims 17-20, 22-24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026478 to Rodgers et al. (*Rodgers*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,961,416 to *Ludwig et al.* (*Ludwig*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

As stated in MPEP § 2143.01, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Rodgers is generally directed towards methods and systems for facilitating the formation and maintenance of multi-user linked groups. *See, e.g., Rodgers Abstract.* More specifically,

Rodgers is directed towards a method of automatically launching and linking a third-party application on a first computer to a corresponding application on a second computer, and systems capable of performing this method *See, e.g., Rodgers* paragraph 11; Fig. 3. Numerous variations to the method and systems are disclosed, including methods for generating and communicating links, and varying functionality of the linking software *See, e.g., Rodgers* paragraphs 13- 20.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Rodgers* fails to disclose or suggest many distinctive features of the present application. For example, Applicants submit, and the Examiner agrees, *Rodger* does not teach or suggest “wherein at least a portion of the sharer desktop region can be viewed in the viewer display region, and no portion of the sharer taskbar region is accessible or visible to the remote multimedia device” in independent Claim 17. Similarly, as provided in Claim 22, *Rogers* does not teach or suggest “sharing at least a portion of the sharer desktop region of the local multimedia device with the remote multimedia device, while preventing any portion of the taskbar region from being shared with the remote multimedia device.” In addition, *Rodgers* does not teach or suggest limitations in the dependent claims 16-21, 23-26, including, but not limited to, the limitation of “at least a portion of the viewer desktop region corresponds to ... the portion of the sharer desktop region that is being shared with the remote multimedia device” as recited in Claim 20, the limitation of “there is no overlap between the taskbar region and the desktop region...” as recited in Claim 26.

(a.) Ludwig does not teach or suggest the inventive concept of sharing a window with a remote user where no portion of the taskbar region is visible or accessible to the remote user.

In contrast to the claimed invention, the Snapshot Share windows in *Ludwig* provide the ability of either party to manipulate the material in the shared window. Thus, the operational and functionality buttons used to control, operate, or manipulate the data, e.g., control areas in the taskbar region, are included within the window such that they are both visible and accessible to both parties. *Ludwig*, in fact, teaches away from showing no portion of taskbar region because the window is configured for sharing the control of the data in the window. Therefore, in view

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 10/738,357

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE DATED JULY 18, 2007

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION OF APRIL 18, 2007

of Ludwig, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to share a window but share “no portion of the taskbar region.”

Because *Ludwig* cannot cure the deficiencies of *Rodgers* with respect to any independent claims 17 and 22, or the claims that depend therefrom, and because there is no apparent reason to combine *Rodgers* and *Ludwig*, Applicants hereby respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17-20, 22-24 and 26 as being unpatentable over *Rodgers* in view of *Ludwig*.

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 10/738,357
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE DATED JULY 18, 2007
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION OF APRIL 18, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that a variance exists between the amount tendered and that required by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to enter and consider this Reply, or to prevent abandonment of the present application, please charge or credit such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-2613 (Order Number 45098.00017.UTL1.P1068).

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 18, 2007

By: Amy E. Simpson
Amy E. Simpson, Esq.
Reg. No. 54,688

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
P.O. Box 92191
San Diego, CA 92191-9092
PH: (858) 720-2500
FX: (858) 720-2555
Customer No. 36183